

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8 and 21-24 are pending. In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-8, 21, 22, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by admitted prior art. These rejections are respectfully traversed. The Office Action indicated claims 4 and 23 include allowable subject matter.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 21, 22, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by admitted prior art (APA). When making a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102, a necessary condition is that the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. (see MPEP, §706.02). If any claimed element is missing from the applied reference, then the claim is distinguishable over the reference.

The admitted prior art is discussed on pages 1-3 of the Applicant's specification and shown in figure 1 of the Applicant's figures. In particular page 1, lines 7-10 of the Applicant's specification recite,

FIG. 1 illustrates a portion of a Van De Graaf apparatus according to the related art. A Van De Graaf apparatus is typically manufactured on a macroscopic scale and is often used to raise the hair of students during high school science demonstrations as the students touch the apparatus with their hands.

Independent claim 1 recites a movable component, a first protrusion, and a second protrusion each having a size of a micrometer scale or smaller. The rejection of claim 1 alleges the admitted prior art discloses the belt 30 of figure 1 is a moveable component of about the thickness of 2 electrons. The rejection of claim 1 further alleges that the rollers 40 and 50 of figure 1 are protrusions having a thickness of about 13 electrons.

The APA does not teach or suggest that the belt 30 is 2 electrons thick and does not teach or suggest that the rollers 40 and 50 are 13 electrons thick. It is unclear how the Examiner came up with the 2-electron and 13-electron thicknesses, because these thicknesses are not included in the Applicant's specification discussing figure 1. If this rejection is maintained, the Examiner must point out where the disclosure of these thicknesses is provided in the APA.

Furthermore, the APA discloses a Van De Graaf apparatus having a scale that is much larger than the claimed micrometer scale (or smaller) for the movable component, the first protrusion, and the second protrusion. The APA discloses a Van De Graaf apparatus on a macroscopic scale that is often used to raise the hair of students during high school science demonstrations as the students touch the apparatus with their hands. Certainly, a micrometer-scaled electronic-charge-transferring device would not generate enough charge to raise the hair of students during high school science demonstrations as the students touch the micrometer-scaled electronic-charge-transferring device with their hands. Thus, the APA teaches away from the claimed invention, and claims 1-3, 5-8, 21, 22, and 24 are believed to be allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

As all of the outstanding rejections have been traversed and all of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, the Applicant respectfully requests issuance of a Notice of Allowability. If the undersigned attorney can assist in any matters regarding examination of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary Gibson

Dated: January 27, 2005

By Ashok K

Ashok K. Mannava  
Registration No. 45,301

MANNAVA & KANG, P.C.  
8221 Old Courthouse Road  
Suite 104  
Vienna, VA 22182  
(703) 652-3822  
(703) 880-5270 (fax)